

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 22 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-30, as amended, are pending in this application. In this Response, Applicant has amended certain claims. In particular, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 19 to overcome the Examiner's summary rejection of these claims.

In light of the Office Action, Applicant believes these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents. As no new matter has been added, Applicant respectfully requests entry of these amendments at this time.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner issued the § 112 rejection because the "Applicant did not point out where in the specification discloses 'the information retrieved to enter into the at least one field of form is stored in a location specifically associated with the form and the field.'" Support for these features can be found at, for example, Page 19, line 20 - Page 20, line 5 and Page 20, lines 12-14. In light of the support in the written description, Applicant submits that the Examiner's § 112(1) rejections have been overcome.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 14, 19-21, 23, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant is unclear as to the reasons for the § 112(2) rejections because the Examiner has failed to specify why "[t]he scope of the claims can not be determined." Moreover, skilled artisans will readily recognize the meaning of each of the features recited in the rejected claims. In light of the Examiner's failure to specify a reason for the rejections under § 112, and the knowledge of those skilled in the art, Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

At pages 3-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 14, 19-21, 23, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0107755 to Steed *et al.* ("Steed") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010715 to Chinn *et al.* ("Chinn"). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejections have been traversed.

Steed discloses a server based electronic wallet system. The system facilitates purchases from a wireless device by detecting, at a proxy, that a wireless device is attempting to access a form from a merchant server. *See* Para. 0008. The form, which requires information to be entered, is automatically filled in at the proxy. *Id.* The filled-in form is then delivered to the wireless device together with a hyper-link to a file stored on a wallet server. *Id.* Upon receipt at the wallet server of an instruction from the wireless device, information is delivered to a merchant server, enabling a transaction to be completed. *Id.*

One embodiment of the present invention, in contrast, comprises a method for automatically entering information into form fields. The method includes invoking an application program in response to an indication from a user of a mobile device to do so. *See, e.g.* Claim 1. Content transmitted from the application program to the mobile device is scanned to find a form having at least one field into which information is to be entered. *Id.* When at least one mapping for a form exists, the present invention retrieves and enters information into the at least one field and transmits the form, including the entered information, to the mobile device for display to the user. *Id.*

However, when no mappings for the form exist, a clear difference between the present invention and Steed becomes abundantly clear. *Id.* That is, when no mappings for the form exist, the present invention transmits the form to the mobile device. *Id.* Then, at least one selection of information to be entered into the at least one field of the form is received from the user of the mobile device. *Id.* A mapping that specifies how to fill-in fields in the form is then created. *Id.* The created mapping is based on the at least one selection of information that is received from the user of the mobile device. *Id.* The form including the at least one selection of information is then transmitted to the application program.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Steed does not disclose creating a mapping for a form if no mappings for a form exist. *See* Office Action at Page 4. However, in the Examiner's Response to Arguments, the Examiner seems to contract this admission by stating that

Steed's disclosure reads on the claimed features of the present invention. Despite this contradiction, Applicant submits that the Examiner's acknowledgement that Steed is silent with regard to creating a mapping is correct.

Steed stores a list of merchant pay page URL's that can be updated from time to time. *See* Para. 0021. A wallet proxy (14) profiles these pages by storing, for each merchant page, a mapping of field definitions to specific values based on user data. *See* Para. 0023. However, when a URL is not recognized as a merchant pay page that is served by the wallet proxy software (14), the wallet proxy software (14) "plays no further part." *See* Para. 0022 (emphasis added). In other words, when no mappings for the a URL's form exist, Steed merely enables a connection to the Internet, and plays no further role with regard to mapping. *Id.* Again, this explicit disclosure by Steed conclusively demonstrates that Steed is completely silent with regard to at least the creation of a mapping based on the at least one selection of information by a user.

In an attempt to cure the deficiencies of Steed, the Examiner cited Chinn. Although programming languages such as HTML and XML are suitable for display on a desktop computer, they are generally not suited for mobile devices. *See* Para. 0003. Thus, Chinn discloses a system and method for browsing using a limited display device. Along these lines, Chinn discloses a processor that converts a conventional markup language document into a navigation tree that provides a semantic, hierarchical structure that includes some or all of the content included in the web pages presented by the convention markup language documents. *See* Para. 0006. For each conventional markup language document, Chinn constructs a document tree that has a number of nodes. *See* Para. 0009.

In order to construct the document tree, Chinn uses metadata, such as declarative statements and procedural statements. *See* Para. 0008. If procedural statements are present, Chinn applies these to construct a navigational tree. *See* Para. 0009. If there are no procedural statements, Chinn applies a mapping procedure to convert the document tree into a navigation tree. *Id.* A user can navigate through the web pages and access the content stored on the site by traversing the nodes in the navigation tree. *See* Para. 0010. Chinn further discloses that a form in a document tree can be mapped to create a form node in a navigation tree. *See* Para. 0113. Thus, the "mapping" disclosed by Chinn relates to creating a navigation tree from a document tree, which is unrelated to the subject matter claimed by the present invention.

Chinn does not teach or even suggest creating a mapping for the form that specifies how to fill-in fields in the form into which stored information is to be entered based on the received selection of information from the user of the mobile device. In fact, Chinn does not even tangentially relate to entering information into a form. Even more remote is any teaching or suggestion of creating a mapping in the manner recited by claims 1, 10, and 19 of the present invention.

In sum, neither Steed nor Chin, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of the present invention currently recited in independent claims 1, 10, and 19. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits that the Examiner's § 103 rejections have been overcome. As such, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments and remarks still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicant invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith extending the time for response three months to and including January 22, 2007. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Bingham McCutchen LLP Deposit Account No. 195127, Order No. 19111.0059.

Respectfully submitted,
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

Dated: January 22, 2007

By: 

Siddhesh V. Pandit, Registration No. 58,572
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 373-6513 Telephone
(202) 424-7647 Facsimile